

REMARKS

Applicant is grateful for the finding that some of the claims are allowable. However, a review of the reasons for allowance reveals that the allowable claims require that "a CSWL inquiry is not mapped to said associated mid-level cache but is mapped to said non-associated mid-level cache" and as a result, "generating an inter-mid-level cache lock request" and that this is the basis for the allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests a review of the wording of the other claims which also indicate similar grounds for allowance.

For example, paragraph "c" of claim 1 sets forth that there must be an interpreter which determines whether there is a mapping of a CSWL inquiry to the associated mid-level cache, "

- c. *Interprefer for reading the signals in a received CSWL inquiry to determine if it relates to a CSWL mapped to said associated mid-level cache and what each particular lock request function requires for said received CSWL inquiry,....*

Clearly to allow for handling by this associated cache IF, but only IF the CSWL inquiry is mapped to this associated cache. What claim 5 does is establish a system by which CSWL inquiries sent to the wrong cache can be handled. However, there are other ways in which CSWL inquiries sent to the wrong cache can be handled. For example, given the situation where CSWL inquiries could be broadcast over the radial to all Second Level Caches (SLCs), the SLC which does have a CSWL mapped to it will respond to the inquiry and the other SLC's should simply ignore it. (Description of broadcast over radial described; Application, page 11, lines 14-26). This feature of determining whether a lock inquiry is for a particular cache, by that cache, is not found in Vartti, because it is not needed in Vartti since there are only two second level caches in Vartti. Vartti identifies processors as local or remote, depending upon which storage controller a processor is associated with, and therefore conclusively knows without having to determine whether a lock request is from a local or remote processor without making any determination based on information in the "query". (Vartti, col7, lines 36-65.) Thus, it appears fairly conclusive

that this feature of section c, (which is reinforced in section d) of claim 1 is not present in Vartti.

Furthermore, Vartti cannot fairly be shown to have CSWL's as that term is defined in the specification of the application. (See application, last paragraph on page 6 and first two on page 7). The two kinds of software locks the instant application is talking about appear to be different from those in Vartti, which in its background section (Col 1, lines 28-49) appears to describe the kinds of locks Vartti addresses. In all the mentions of locks in Vartti, none require that they can't be moved from SCL to SCL, something which we do require in our preferred embodiments, nor is there any indication of a mapping of lock to SLC that can be known to other SLCs which is part of what we describe as a feature of CSWLs. Accordingly, the whole notion that Vartti has CSWL handling appears to be incorrect.

Although the method claims that are rejected are rejected over Amarilli, This reference too lacks the same elements described in the discussion above with respect to Vartti. Coincidentally, the same feature of making a determination that a CSWL is appropriate for this SLC receiving a query is described in method form also in part c, but here it is part c of claim 15.

Accordingly, as there are significant components of the same elements that the examiner has found patentably distinct in all of the claims, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all the rejected claims in light of these elements, which may have been overlooked in the previous step of examination. This may have been because in the broadest claims this feature does not show any active follow-on step, but, as indicated above, if all the SLCs get a CSWL query, such an active follow-on step is not needed. Since the active step of sending the query to a second SLC that had the CSWL mapped to it instead of the one receiving the query highlighted this feature in the claims found allowable, it is believed and strongly urged that the same underlying structure, not present in the cited art, applies to make these broadest, and consequently all the claims, allowable.

The applicant therefore requests allowance of all claims in light of the above discussion, and that the application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



8/6/2004

Michael B. Atlass
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 30,606
Unisys Corporation
Unisys Way
M.S. E8-114
Blue Bell, PA 19424
Tele No. (215) 986-4111